

Town Meeting



Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

How Should Democracy Deal With Groups Which Aim To Destroy Democracy?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

ROBERT A. TAFT
RICHARD M. NIXON

THURMAN W. ARNOLD
RALPH E. MCGILL

(See also page 12)

COMING

—May 25, 1948—

What's Wrong With Our Cities?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 4



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MAY 18:

"How Should Democracy Deal With Groups Which Aim To Destroy Democracy?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Judge ARNOLD	4
Senator TAFT	6
Mr. MCGILL	8
Congressman NIXON	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16



THE BROADCAST OF MAY 25:

"What's Wrong With Our Cities?"



The Broadcast of May 18, 1948, originated in Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MAY 18, 1948

VOL. 14, No. 4

How Should Democracy Deal With Groups Which Aim To Destroy Democracy?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors, Attorney General Clark, and friends of the N.E.A. The seat of our democratic government is a most appropriate place to discuss tonight's subject. We've seen two types of totalitarianism at work in the world in our time. Both types, fascism and communism, drove to power by the use of the basic freedoms of democracy in order to destroy democracy.

We at Town Hall are vitally concerned by what we see going on in the world today, as one state after another loses its basic freedoms under the impact of totalitarian aggression—not by force of arms, but by the effective use and abuse of our democratic freedoms.

Naturally, we want to maintain and preserve free discussion in America. That's what Town Hall stands for and always has stood for. But events prompt us to inquire if there's not some distinction between a free and open dis-

cussion, between contestants who believe in maintaining the forum in which the discussion takes place, and a discussion in which one of the parties is committed to the destruction of the forum itself. If there is, what should we do about it?

Many of us heard this subject discussed in part last night by two candidates for the Republican nomination for President. Their debate ended in a disagreement over the meaning of the so-called Mundt-Nixon Bill, one of the co-authors of which is here to speak for us tonight.

In this discussion tonight, however, we are not considering the question of whether the Communist Party should be outlawed or not. We are well aware that the cloak of communism has many colors. After long years of struggle, we've found a way of settling disputes here in America, between free men by means of law and reason. We call this democracy.

To protect the essentials of democracy, should we then allow those who destroy it the same rights and privileges as those who would preserve it?

Should we allow those individuals and groups who have voluntarily pledged their allegiance to a party whose first loyalty is to a foreign despotism the free use of freedoms they seek to destroy?

Tonight, we're seeking the counsel of a distinguished United States Senator who is also a leading candidate for the Republican nomination for President, a member of the Congressional Committee on un-American Activities, a former Assistant Attorney General, and an eminent American journalist on the question, "How Should Democracy Deal With Groups Which Aim to Destroy Democracy?"

We're to hear first from the former Assistant Attorney General, a Democrat and a New Dealer, now a practising attorney here in Washington, who tonight finds himself in agreement with a certain candidate for the Republican nomination for President, Judge Thurman Arnold. Judge Arnold.

Judge Arnold:

Mr. Moderator, this is not the first time I've agreed with a Republican. During the years I was responsible for anti-trust enforcement, no man in the Senate gave me stronger support or more sympathetic encouragement than Senator Taft.

Now I'm agreeing with another Republican. I heard the Dewey-Stassen debate, and I'm ready to give the decision—Dewey, except for his lack of clarity on the Mundt Bill, is right. Stassen is absolutely and unequivocally wrong.

I am aware that Communists are reaching into this country, trying to use our freedom of speech in order to destroy our freedoms. Trying to subvert our Constitutional guarantees for totalitarian ends. They think this will succeed because they believe freedom of speech is unworkable.

Men like Mr. Stassen and Mr. Nixon, sincere and conscientious though they may be, have, unfortunately for all of us, the same lack of faith in the strength of our democratic institutions that Russia has. They do not want to trust the American people to reject communism through the process of free election in which ideas subversive to our own system may be advocated and voted down.

Such men are unwittingly walking arm in arm with the Communists. They have become fellow travelers without knowing it. They are undermining the confidence of the American people in the effectiveness of free speech and free association as a bulwark of democracy, and that precisely is what Russia is trying to do.

There have been times in the past, like today, when we wavered in our confidence and faith in democracy, when we prosecuted

dissenting groups with ideas which were contrary to our way of life.

Our Puritan oligarchy saw in the Quakers a threat against their church government. They passed savage legislation to drive Quakers from New England. The result was to strengthen the Quakers and to write a chapter in our history of which today we are ashamed.

After the Revolution, the Federalist Party passed the infamous Alien and Sedition Law aimed at suppressing agents of the French Government who were the Communists of that time. Instead of strengthening the Federalist Party, those laws helped to destroy it.

In the sixteenth century, Spain had a great empire spreading over the old world and the new. Elizabeth of England was a heretic. That to the Spaniards meant what communism today means to us. Elizabeth was conducting a cold war against Philip, using, like Stalin today, every device of chicanery and deception. She secretly commissioned privateers like Drake and Hawkins to prey on Spanish commerce, while publicly denying it.

Philip of Spain thought he had the answer. He believed that he could strengthen Spain by destroying heresy and so every time Elizabeth's privateers sank a Spanish ship or raided a Spanish town, more heretics were burned.

This solved no problems for Spain. Instead, it bled Spain white.

So today, when Hitler entered Czechoslovakia, we fired ten motion picture actors. Today, we are attacking our scientists, we are creating a paralyzing atmosphere of doubt and fear over this country. If we meet those who join a party to promote communism in democratic debate at the polls, we will not only beat them, we will reduce them to a crackpot rate.

Governor Dewey said that so far as protection against foreign agents or danger of violence is concerned, our present laws are sufficient. He implied that if you take the unconstitutional part out of the Mundt Bill, there will be nothing left which adds anything to what we have already got.

I only regret that he did not point out that the Mundt Bill is a symptom of panic that adds fuel to the witch hunt that is now going on, that in substance is an expression of lack of confidence in American democracy.

Now this is a criticism of Dewey. At one time I was favorably impressed with Governor Stassen. Yet, last night, he sounded to me as if he might be on the way—I hope I'm wrong—as if he might be on the way to becoming a Republican Huey Long. As I listened, he seemed to me to be surrendering the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States to political expedience. (*Applause.*)

U. OF ₅ L
LIBRARY

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Judge Arnold. Well, after last night's debate between Governors Dewey and Stassen, I'm sure that all of us will be deeply interested in the views of Senator Taft on this very basic question. We are happy to welcome back to Town Meeting, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who is also a candidate for the Republican nomination for President, the Honorable Robert A. Taft. Senator Taft. (*Applause.*)

Senator Taft:

Friends of the radio audience, ladies and gentlemen. A feeling of uncertainty and lack of confidence prevails throughout the United States today, because the American people don't know whether or not we face a Third World War against communism.

The condition arises solely out of the obvious determination of the Russian Government to spread communism throughout the world until it dominates every country of the world. The great question mark today is whether the principles of free government will ultimately prevail or the principles of communism.

I am hopeful this conflict may never reach the stage of military action, but it already covers every other field and every effort of our Government is bent today to block the spread of communism.

The Marshall Plan, unjustifiable from any economic standpoint, is

proposing to spend billions to build up Western Europe more rapidly so that their soil may be less fertile for the spread of communism.

We have set up an American propaganda service to combat throughout the world the efficient communist propaganda.

We are aiding governments where a majority of the people desire to be free by giving them armaments against militant minorities of their own people financed from communist sources.

We intervened in the Italian elections, as we would never have done before the war, because the Russians had already intervened.

We are spending billions of the taxpayers' money to fight this war abroad. Surely we should do everything reasonable to discourage the spread of communism right here at home. (*Applause.*)

The threat of communist progress here is less perhaps than it was a year ago, because the popular feeling against Russian aggression is much stronger, but it is still here. The only reasonable conclusion from the facts is that the communist movement here and elsewhere is directed from Russia. Therefore, it is not only an attack aimed at the destruction of American principles of government but aimed at the freedom of the American people.

The only question we have to meet is the best method of acting to check that attack. I fully agree

that we must not violate the Constitution. We do not want to abandon the principles of liberty found in the Bill of Rights lest we ourselves destroy, here at home, the very freedom we are trying to protect.

I do not think we can make it illegal to be a communist or to think communism or to talk communism if it does not go to the extent of advocating the seizure of the Government by violence.

Therefore, we cannot outlaw communism but certainly there are steps we can take. We can see that the Government itself does not employ Communists. We have passed laws to that effect.

We can refuse privileges to labor unions who elect communist officers as we have done in the Taft-Hartley Act. Mr. Denham of the National Labor Relations Board says this has proved to be one of the most effective anti-Red weapons in existence. The infiltration into labor unions is one of the easiest and most effective weapons used by communism, notably in Czechoslovakia.

In the third place, we can bring Communists out into the open so that the people are advised whether they are Communists or not. One of the most effective weapons of advancing communism is the concealment of the communist connections.

The un-American Activities Committee has done real service in letting the people know of Com-

munist in influential positions so that we can form a more intelligent judgment of their writings and speeches. The Mundt-Nixon Bill pursues the same principle of bringing Communists into the open, by requiring communist organizations to register so that propaganda cannot be carried on without the people being advised of its source.

I have not studied all the details of the Mundt Bill. I have some criticism of the definition of communist political organizations and communist-front organizations. The definition may amount to such a badge of disloyalty as to drive all Communists underground and defeat the purpose of the bill. But I do feel that communist connection with a foreign government has such a strong presumption to support it today that registration under some definition should certainly be required.

In the last analysis, however, our success against communism in the world and our success against communism at home depend upon the education of the peoples of the world in the principles of free government. (*Applause.*)

We must make as strong a crusade for those principles throughout the world as the Communists are making for communism. (*Applause.*)

We have a better cause. We did it after 1776. The principles of liberty spread throughout the world until they dominated the

thinking of a large section of the world throughout the nineteenth century. We must stop apologizing for our form of government. We must constantly seek to improve the condition of our people, but we must point out that already our system has succeeded in bringing about that improvement where totalitarianism has always failed.

We must review our faith in liberty and equality and justice under law. If we can bring this battle out into the open, on the basis of history and logic, our faith must, and will, prevail. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Taft. Our next speaker is not only a distinguished representative of the South but is a world citizen who has represented his country on many international commissions and surveys. He is the editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, one of the most highly respected men in his profession of journalist. Mr. Ralph McGill. Mr. McGill. (*Applause.*)

Mr. McGill:

Ladies and gentlemen. It is pleasing to me, a Southern Democrat who isn't going to bolt his party (*laughter and applause*) to be in agreement with Senator Taft, in opposition to legislative attempts to outlaw Communists, Fascists, or other subversive groups.

Democracy hasn't any reason to be afraid of its processes if it keeps

them vital. We can best outlaw the Communist Party by fully participating in our own Government. The only new legislation I'd like to see is a law requiring every person to vote. (*Applause.*)

The bill proposed by the House Committee, quite sincerely and patriotically I know, seems to me an effort to get at communism through the side door. It does not ban the party per se, but proposes severe penalties for any person or groups seeking to establish a totalitarian dictatorship.

That is a moot proposal. The Communists never establish a totalitarian dictatorship until they control the government. As Eastern Europe plainly demonstrates today, it is then too late for a law to operate.

The lie and the change of coats are communist techniques. They operate under many names and they ride many coat tails. The latest illustration is in the Wallace Third Party Campaign.

Law, for example, could not deal with the transparent communist use of the Wallace campaign as illustrated by the recent open letter exchange between Prime Minister Stalin and Mr. Wallace. It was obvious long ago that someone in the Wallace board of strategy has access to information from Soviet sources in this country.

Having used the Wallace campaign as a propaganda vehicle to present the Soviet Union as the only nation really seeking world

peace, I think we may now expect the Communist Party to disavow Mr. Wallace, and thereby seek to get him more votes.

Our Federal Constitution and laws already existing prohibit certain activities of our citizens, such as treason, conspiracy, oaths of allegiance to foreign powers, and so on. It may be desirable to amplify these, but I doubt the necessity of it. The best weapon is to bring the Communists and their activities into the open.

The danger in outlawing legislation is that it always develops cracks in its own fence, and as more laws are added to plug them up, we soon deprive ourselves of our own rights in seeking to control a minority.

Under our constitution, the citizen has the right to advocate radical social changes or changes of government.

Perjury and the lie are communist weapons—I've already said so before. Therefore, the loyalty oath and the pledge of allegiance, it seems to me, would be made a mockery by this communist technique.

History is a good teacher. Let us call the roll of the communist despots who head the communist satellite states of Eastern Europe. We will find that every one of them at one time or another was in jail, when the Communist Party was outlawed in their countries as the then-existing governments

sought to protect against communism with jail sentences.

Josip Broz, now Tito of Yugoslavia, was jailed by King Alexander's anti-Communist laws from 1928 until just before the Spanish Civil War began.

Georgi Dimitrov of Bulgaria, now the head of that state, was in jail for 10 years.

Ana Pauker is the leading Communist authority in Rumania. She has been in and out of jail since 1918. There are many others.

Our best defense is to set our own house in order. We cannot protect ourselves by becoming hysterical and becoming afraid of our own institutions and our own resources, and our own faith in our own democracy. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. McGill. Well, Mr. Nixon, last night debaters had quite a discussion over the meaning of your bill, as to whether it outlawed the Communist Party or not, and we are glad to be able to have you here in person tonight. We hope that you'll answer the question for us that will help to find the answer to the basic question—"How Should Our Democracy Deal With Groups Which Aim to Destroy Democracy." Mr. Nixon, also a Quaker, Mr. Arnold, is a Congressman from California, and a member of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, and is co-author of the

so-called Mundt-Nixon Bill. Congressman Nixon. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Nixon:

Thank you, Mr. Denny, ladies and gentlemen. Just a couple of comments about the speakers who have preceded me, at least two of them. As a member of the Un-American Activities Committee I've been called a number of things in my service on that committee, but for the first time tonight, Mr. Arnold has called me a "fellow-traveler."

I'm also quite interested in the comments of Mr. McGill that he did not believe that legislation was an answer to this problem because I have before me a quote from an editorial in the *Atlanta Constitution* on April 7, in which it states: "It is patently absurd that we have not implemented our legislation so as to prevent Communists not from speaking but from occupying any parliamentary position in private organizations, especially labor unions."

I might say, incidentally, that the Mundt-Nixon Bill does not even go that far.

I wish it were possible, tonight, to take the easy way of answering this question by simply saying, as Mr. Arnold has, that no action whatever should or needs to be taken against subversive groups in the United States except to tolerate them and let democracy stand on its own feet against its enemies.

There are those who sublimely

contend that all we have to do is to make democracy work better than anything else, and then we shall have nothing to fear. I realize, incidentally, that many well-intentioned people, who call themselves liberal, indulge in this fantasy, but let them remember, however, that the liberal who wants to tolerate everything may wake up some day to find out that he himself is not being tolerated, but is liquidated. It has happened elsewhere and it can happen here. (*Applause.*)

We are faced today with a world conspiracy threatening our very existence as a free people. The ultimate objective of this conspiracy with respect to the United States is to overthrow our free American institutions in favor of a communist totalitarian dictatorship to be controlled from abroad. I submit that this threat cannot be adequately met with abject appeasement and toleration on the legislative front.

The Mundt-Nixon bill presently before the House is the legislative approach to the communist problem in the United States. It has been carefully drafted so as not to violate constitutional freedoms, but at the same time to be effective against the threat with which we are faced.

The bill carefully separates the subversive from those who with honest attentions disagree with the status quo on any issue in the United States.

In the legislative approach to the problem, which has been posed in tonight's question, we started from the premise that it is necessary to strike a balance between liberty to oppose our government and license to subvert our freedoms to the domination of a foreign conspiracy.

This legislative approach is not aimed—and this is important—at communism as an ideology, and I agree whole-heartedly with Mr. Arnold and Mr. McGill on that point, but at the subversive activities of Communists in the United States at which legislation can and should be directed.

The bill is aimed at accomplishing two major objectives.

1. It strikes at the unquestionably subversive activities of communist activity in the United States by making it a crime for any person to attempt, in any manner, to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship under the domination of a foreign power. Both elements are necessary. This provision is based on the principle that no person should have the right to abuse constitutional freedoms by working for the establishment of a foreign-dominated dictatorship in the United States which would destroy the freedom of all but those in power.

2. The bill is aimed, as Senator Taft has explained, at exposing the foreign domination and character of the communist movement in the United States by requiring

the Communist Party and organizations controlled by it to register with the Attorney General.

A carefully worked out procedure for administrative hearings and court reviews, incidentally, a great improvement over the present ex parte proceedings being followed by the Attorney General, is set up in the bill so as to protect innocent people and organizations from being affected by the registration requirements.

This provision, in effect, will let the American people know who the members of the Communist Party are, what organizations are dominated and controlled by them. Secrecy and fraud are essential to the success of the communist movement. Once the foreign-dominated character of the movement is exposed, I am confident that the American people will overwhelmingly reject it.

From a study of the bill's major provisions, it will be seen that it does not attempt to outlaw communism as a theory. Ideas must be combatted with ideas and not with legislation, but we have, on the contrary, sought to strike a body blow at the American cadre of the foreign-directed communist conspiracy. We believe that if its subversive activities are prosecuted, its false fronts exposed, and its foreign assistance and direction cut away, the movement in the United States, standing alone for what it is, will be overwhelmingly de-

feated in the open market place of political ideas.

Far from injuring true liberal and progressive movements, the enactment and enforcement of this bill will be an outstanding contribution to such causes in the United States. Every liberal cause which the Communists touch is irreparably damaged by them, and if Communists are spotlighted for the foreign agents that they are,

truly liberal and progressive groups will be able successfully to resist communist efforts to subvert humanitarian causes to their own ends.

I do not contend that legislation alone is enough to meet the threat of communism to democracy. The bill now before Congress is not the complete answer to the communist problem in the United States. Education without question

THE SPEAKER'S COLUMN

ROBERT A. TAFT — Republican Senator from Ohio since 1939, Robert Taft is one of the leading contenders for the Republican nomination for the Presidency. The son of William Howard Taft, 27th President of the United States, Robert Taft was born in Cincinnati but lived at the White House during his father's term of office. He attended Taft School at Watertown, Conn.; Yale University where he received his B.A.; and Harvard, where he received his LL.B. He also has several honorary degrees.

Senator Taft began his practice of law in Cincinnati in 1913. From 1917 to 1919, he was assistant counsel of the U.S. Food Administration. From 1921 to 1926, he was a member of the Ohio House of Representatives, serving as Speaker in 1926. In 1931-32, he was a member of the Ohio Senate.

In the U.S. Senate, Robert Taft is head of the Labor Committee and second in command of the Finance Committee. Last year he helped to write the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

RALPH EMERSON MCGILL — Mr. McGill was born in Soddy, Tennessee, in 1898. He attended McCallie Preparatory School and Vanderbilt University. His college days were interrupted by service in the Marine Corps during World War I. He received an honorary LL.B. from Atlanta Law School, in 1938. For a year he was sports editor on the *Banner* in Nashville, Tennessee. In 1931, he became sports editor of the *Constitution* in Atlanta, Georgia. In 1938, he was made executive editor and since 1942, he has been editor.

Mr. McGill has served as special advisor and consultant to the Department of State. He was chairman of his selective service board from 1940 to 1944. In

1937, Mr. McGill was awarded the Rosenwald Fellowship for travel in Europe.

THURMAN ARNOLD — Born in Laramie, Wyoming, in 1891, Thurman Arnold came East for his college education—A.B., Princeton, 1911; LL.B., Harvard, 1914; and M.A., Yale, 1931. Admitted to the Illinois bar, he began the practice of law in Chicago. Returning to his home town, he practiced law at Laramie from 1919 to 1927. He also lectured in law at the University of Wyoming from 1921 to 1926, when he became dean of the College of Law of the University of West Virginia (1927-30). Since 1931, Mr. Arnold has been a professor at Yale, but in 1937 he was granted a leave of absence to serve as special assistant to the attorney general of the United States. In March, 1939, he became assistant attorney general in charge of antitrust work in which position he became familiarly known as the "trust buster" of the Department of Justice. Early in 1943 he was appointed an associate justice of the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. He resigned from this position in 1945.

RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON — Born in Yorba Linda, California, in 1913, Congressman Nixon has an A.B. from Whittier College and an LL.B. from Duke University Law School. From 1937 until 1942, he practiced law in Whittier, California. Then, from January to August, 1942, he was attorney with the office of Emergency Management in Washington, D.C. From 1942 until 1946, he was a lieutenant commander in the United States Navy. Elected to the 80th Congress, he is a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee and House Education and Labor Committee.

is a powerful weapon at our disposal in this fight.

The American people must be made aware of the true character, aims, and techniques of the world communist conspiracy and of the great qualities of our own constitutional system of government. With this knowledge we shall build a mighty bulwark against this threat. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Nixon. Well, gentlemen, I think we ought to have a little discussion up here before we take the questions from this representative audience here in Constitution Hall, and I wonder if Judge Arnold would start the discussion with a comment and question. Judge Arnold.

Judge Arnold: Mr. Nixon, I've read your bill. It's 41 pages long; I can't very well analyze it. I understand that you claim that it is a bill which doesn't attack ideology. It seems to me that it unquestionably does. Among the things, for example, which may be considered to determine whether an organization is communist is the extent to which it supports or advocates the basic principles of Marx and Lenin. Then, finally, here's the crime—"actively to participate in the management, direction, or supervision of any movement to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship." Now I think that so-

cialism inevitably leads to a totalitarian dictatorship. Why is it that your bill penalizes socialism?

Congressman Nixon: Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Arnold, if you have read the entire provision of the bill which you are quoting, you would have noted that it does not. In the first place, you said that the bill prohibits working for the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. You forgot to read in, and you glossed over, the words "such a totalitarian dictatorship" which was described in the previous section as a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control. The socialists are not advocating a totalitarian dictatorship subject to foreign control.

Now, going to the other point which you raised, that the ideology of Marx and Lenin might bear on whether or not an organization was communist, you will note that when you read the definition that that ideology of Marx and Lenin has relationship to this subject only when it is an element in determining whether the organization is under the control of a foreign communist government, or a foreign communist political organization. That's the answer to the question. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Taft, have you any comments at this point? Or can you clarify the discussion between these two gentlemen?

Senator Taft: My principal dif-

faculty with the definition of a communist organization is that it seems to designate a communist organization as something which is so much a traitorous organization that by filing a statement admitting that you are a communist political organization you almost convict yourself of treason. I wonder whether it won't, therefore, lead to a refusal on the part of anyone to register—and to the disappearance of communist organizations entirely except under ground?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Nixon, will you come in, please?

Congressman Nixon: Senator Taft's statement is well taken, and may I say that the committee intentionally made this definition particularly tight and made it apply only where an organization was under the control of a foreign totalitarian government.

The reason we did that is this: We do not believe that it would be right under our constitutional system to require people to register with the Attorney General if they advocated communism in theory without any foreign connection. So we have nailed it right down to foreign connection, and we intend it to be that way.

Now answering the second question, that this would possibly drive Communists underground because it amounts to treason—I notice the Senator said "almost treason." He is correct. Treason can exist only in time of war. So this could not amount to treason. But going to

the other point, I will say this, that if a communist organization is controlled from abroad within this very tight definition, as the Senator has pointed out, then I certainly think that it should register with the Attorney General and if it does not, that the law should apply to it.

Senator Taft: Well, my suggestion is that there is such a presumption that communism is some way connected that we might well require the registration of any communist organization, simply in order that we might know they were there, or simply that they can't operate without being known and that if they put out propaganda it is known to come from communist sources.

I would think the definition should be much more general and should not carry with it any necessary implication of treason. I don't see why anybody could possibly register under the provision of this particular definition.

Mr. Denny: Congressman Nixon, do you want to comment?

Congressman Nixon: Well, the point that Senator Taft makes is just the opposite of the one that Mr. Arnold makes. Mr. Arnold wants the definition to be tighter. Senator Taft wants it to be broader to cover any Communist organization, so I think the committee has struck a proper balance between the two extremes. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Arnold: I don't want the definition to be tighter. I want

stop this nonsense and put it up to the people at the polls. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Nixon: Let me bring this one point home. Communism has come to power in eight satellite countries of Eastern Europe and in Russia. There is not one country in the world today in which the Communists have come to power as the result of winning the majority of the votes in a democratic election. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. McGill, why are you so quiet back there?

Mr. McGill: It seems to me that this law would be very much like the prohibition law. The Communists would simply change their name to something like the "Patriotic Sons of America," disavow any foreign connection, and, I think, it would be absolutely impossible to prove foreign connection. Also, Mr. Nixon mentioned those eight countries. Every one of them had very strict anti-Communist laws and put Communists in jail for years and they are now Communist governed. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Nixon has an answer to that.

Mr. Nixon: I have an answer to that, and I'll only mention one of the eight countries — Czechoslovakia. Communists were in the government in Czechoslovakia. It was a democratic government. It was the best example of how to get along with Communists, and you

saw what happened there. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Nixon. Now while we get ready for our question period, and we have lots of questions here tonight, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air coming to you from Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C., where we are the guests of the Third National Conference on Citizenship sponsored by the Department of Justice and the National Education Association.

We are hearing a discussion of the question, "How Should Democracy Deal With Groups That Aim to Destroy Democracy?" We are about to hear the questions from the audience.

In the meantime, let me remind you that each week we print the complete text, including the questions and answers, in the Town Meeting Bulletin which you may obtain by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y., enclosing ten cents for printing and delivery. Please allow two weeks for delivery.

If you would like to receive the Bulletin for one year enclose \$4.50; for six months, send \$2.35; or if you would like a trial subscription for 11 weeks, send one dollar.

This conference on citizenship is a good time to remind you of

the opportunity you have to organize Town Meeting groups in your own home, club, schools, or churches. Junior Town Meetings have become so numerous that teachers in high schools all over the country have organized a Junior Town Meeting League. Its president, Dr. George A. Reavis,

is here in the audience with us tonight.

You can have your own Town Hall discussion groups. If you would like suggestion from us, address your inquiry to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Now we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: We're going to begin our question period tonight with a statement and a question from a young man from Hawarden, Iowa, a junior at Hawarden High School. He is the winner of a forum contest conducted by Station WNAX at Sioux City, Iowa. Richard Ball, aged 17, is a football letterman, interested in athletics and politics. He has a comment and a question for Congressman Nixon. Mr. Ball.

Mr. Ball: Thank you, Mr. Denny. The four gentlemen who have just spoken have all offered solutions. Congressman Nixon has upheld the Mundt Bill, while Mr. McGill has taken the opposite stand. Mr. Arnold has pointed out, among other things, that we must defeat those who would destroy democracy at the polls. Before that is possible, I agree with Senator Taft and Representative Nixon that education is an important aspect of the problem.

I believe the most effective way

to defeat groups which aim to destroy democracy is by educating and informing the American public—young and old.

Education should have as its objective the reawakening of our civic responsibilities. We, as a people, have become too complacent, too engrossed in our own personal affairs. Perhaps if each generation had to rewin the precious liberty we now enjoy, we might better appreciate our American heritage. This will not be necessary if we only fulfill our obligation as citizens.

My generation should be informed in the classrooms of our school about subversive groups. Let us learn the need for greater civic responsibilities, such as voting, accepting jury positions, and holding public office, all of which are fundamental in the cause of democracy.

I would suggest we institute a course in schools in philosophies of government; compare the foreign systems with our democracy

point out that under communist and fascist systems inalienable human rights and freedoms are surrendered and a lower standard of living does prevail.

I believe such an educational program would clear up much of the confused thinking that exists today. One hundred and forty million *informed* Americans can be the greatest force for freedom the world has ever known.

I would direct this question to Representative Nixon: How can we best instruct the youth of this country to judge and differentiate between comparative forms of government so that they may know and understand that democracy is the best system?

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Congressman Nixon, some advice to educators. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Nixon: I want to say first of all that that was a magnificent statement and if that is an indication of the kind of young leadership that we're going to have in the future, I'm all for it. (*Applause.*) In fact, the statement was so good that I think that our educational system is standing up pretty well when you see what it produces.

Now, Mr. Dick Ball has asked me what kind of education we can have in order to point out to the youth of America the differences between these various systems. That's a question which an educator can answer better probably

than a Congressman, I can assure you.

But I would say briefly this: I think it is essential that the truth be told, the truth about fascism, the truth about communism, the truth about democracy. I'm confident that if the truth is told that the forces of democracy will win in that battle.

I think that all should be told. I do not think that any of the truth should be suppressed and that is the reason that our bill does not aim at the teaching of a theory or teaching about a theory. We want the facts to come out and for the light of day to shine upon them. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman. A question from the balcony over there for Judge Arnold.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Arnold. It has been claimed that there are laws existent to combat the menace of communism in the United States. What are they and why aren't these laws being vigorously enforced?

Judge Arnold: I think these laws are being enforced. I think that the Communist Party is a cipher today. You've heard a great deal about the need of education. Go before an American college audience and say you're a Communist and see where you come out. Gentlemen, this danger in a free American electorate is nonsense. The laws—I can't go into them because the chairman is

already stopping me—the registration of alien agents, the laws against the inciting of violence—well, I'm afraid the chairman won't let me talk any longer—there are about 27 of them.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the young lady over here on the side.

Lady: I'm an engineer and attorney and a former member of the New Jersey legislature. Senator Taft, I wish to ask you this. Do you feel that the present proceedings of the House un-American Activities Committee are being conducted in a democratic manner?

Senator Taft: Yes. I think—I tried to say it in my speech—I think one of the things that it is proper to do under present circumstances is to show the American people who are Communists and who are not, who have communist connections and who do not have those connections. That's one reason why I think communist organizations, those having some connection with communism, all of such organizations should be required to register so that we know who are Communists and who are not, or who tend to be communists and who are not. I don't think there's any violation of civil rights in that procedure. I believe very strongly that that is a proper method of bringing communism out into the open so that it can be directly met by the American people.

Mr. Arnold: I hate to disagree

with my friend, Senator Taft, but I don't think these investigations are fairly conducted. I do think American citizens are being smeared without an opportunity for a fair hearing. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Congressman Nixon. Difference of opinion makes Town Meeting and horse racing. Come on, Congressman Nixon, let's hear your comments.

Congressman Nixon: Senator Taft needs no support on that point but I should like to say this. If Mr. Arnold feels that the present proceedings are smearing people unjustifiably, then he should not object to a bill which will spell out specifically what is subversive and get away from the smears. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman has a question for Mr. McGill.

Man: Mr. McGill, you say you want to bring Communists into the open. Do you approve of the refusal of the ten Hollywood writers and directors to disclose whether or not they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. McGill: I think that they had a right to refuse to do so until their legal status was qualified and defined. Yes, sir.

Man: Congressman Nixon, do you believe, with Justice Holmes that freedom of expression means the toleration of ideas which we loathe?

Congressman Nixon: I certainly do. And that is why this particular

legislation is not directed against ideas. It's directed against activities. (*Applause.*)

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Arnold. If there are adequate laws to curb subversive elements in this country, why do you believe that communism has thrived to such a degree in the United States?

Mr. Arnold: I don't think it has thrived in the United States. I think Communism is the most unpopular movement in the United States today. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Congressman Nixon?

Congressman Nixon: On that point, Thurman Arnold has just made the statement in answer to a previous question and now that if anybody got on a college platform and said he was a Communist that he wouldn't have an audience. That's just the point. No Communist will admit it and we want to put the spotlight on them so that the people will know who they are. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the back of the hall.

Man: Senator Taft. Why are we afraid of driving Communists underground when they are already underground and keep underground by perjury and every other foul means known amongst men?

Senator Taft: Well, my only feeling is that they make more headway if they infiltrate through all sorts of organizations with no one knowing that they are Com-

munists, than if we know they are Communists. It seems to be the essential and the right thing to do and the best weapon is to bring Communists out into the open.

When you say they haven't influence, they have influence. We have four or five great labor organizations in this country dominated by Communists. Their officers are Communists today. The law is weakening them against other unions because we don't give them the same privileges, but they're still there. They ought to be gotten out. If they are known to be Communists, their names are required to be listed as part of communist organizations, I say the people won't stand for them, in those important positions.

So I think that if you simply abolish the Communist Party, admit nothing at all, or that there is any such party, you will find the same people exactly where they are, and you will have no weapon whatever to oust them from those positions. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator. The lady over on the other side.

Lady: Mr. McGill, what do you think we should do to bring out the Communists as American citizens of the United States of America?

Mr. McGill: It seems to me it is pretty easy to spot them. They always follow a certain formula, a certain line. It is easier to put the spotlight on them that way than it would be by putting a law on

them, which I think would make them cover up, just as Senator Taft said, and carry on their activities without letting anyone know what they represent.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Does that answer your question? Thank you. The lady right here.

Lady: Congressman Nixon, how are you going to determine and prove foreign domination in order to prosecute members of the Communist Party?

Congressman Nixon: I will say this, that if foreign domination of the Communist Party cannot be proved, I do not believe that they should be prosecuted. I am confident that prosecution of Communists on the ground that they are foreign dominated can be undoubtedly sustained in the federal courts, and I believe that the statements of J. Edgar Hoover and of the Attorney General himself will back me up in that particular conclusion.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here.

Man: A question for Mr. Arnold. You call the judicial process "trial by combat." Why has this judicial process failed to combat active treason and spying by the Communists?

Mr. Arnold: I don't think it has failed to combat active treason and spying by the Communists. I think that some of the questions at this meeting are dictated by sheer panic. I don't think there's going to be a communist vote you

can put in your eye. I don't think there's any communist power. I think a lot of the people who are going to vote for Wallace are going to vote as a protest against the two other parties, and deny they ever voted for him. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady down here.

Lady: I address my question to Senator Taft. What do you consider to be a correct definition of a Communist? (*Applause.*)

Senator Taft: A Communist is one who, I think, believes in the principles of the Communist International Organization and who is willing to work for those principles throughout the world. Those principles are quite clearly stated in the Constitution of the Third International and they are stated again in the last meeting of the Communist organization. It means in effect, the belief in a government in which a single party of the proletariat, is in fact the dictator and the totalitarian ruler of all the rest of the people.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator. A question for the next speaker from over on the side.

Man: Congressman Nixon, considering that our espionage, sedition, and treason laws were effective against the Nazis before and during the war, wherein do they fail under the present circumstances?

Congressman Nixon: The only answer I can give to that is the

answer that the Attorney General gave to our committee on legislation when he came before us. We pointed out that Nazis had been successfully prosecuted before World War II and that prosecutions had never been levied against any Communists, that we heard of, who had indulged in the same type of foreign directed activities. The Attorney General said, in effect, that the existing laws were inadequate to cope with the communist threat and that they would have to be strengthened because of the very clever and insidious way that the Communists operate.

The German-American Bund, and the Fascists, and the Nazis, fortunately for us, operated in a very clumsy fashion. The Communist is a different kind of a bird, and consequently, legislation must be directed toward that kind of a bird.

Senator Taft: I'd like to suggest that during the war the Communists made great progress. They put many, many Communists even in the Federal Government itself—even into important positions in the Federal Government. We know that because President Truman asked us last year for \$50,000,000 to get rid of them out of the Federal Government; they were there. (*Applause.*)

Furthermore, approximately one-half of all the great unions making up the C.I.O. were Communist-dominated by the end of the war. They made tremendous headway.

The wars did not prevent it. I think they had the sympathy of the Government, myself, but still the laws were not sufficient to prevent a very rapid growth in employment in the Federal Government and the control of labor unions. So that I think that, perhaps, some new laws were required and we passed laws in both those respects.

Judge Arnold: And so, we are spending \$11,000,000 collecting dossiers on federal employees and less than a million on "Voice of the Air." Is that sense?

Mr. Denny: Thank you. You mean "Voice of America," don't you, Judge Arnold?

Judge Arnold: Yes.

Mr. Denny: Now, while our speakers get ready for their summaries of tonight's question, here's a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: Tonight your Town Meeting salutes Station WMAL, American Broadcasting Company affiliate serving the Nation's capital, which has carried Town Meeting since its first broadcast 13 years ago. Our fan mail from Washington and vicinity reveals listening audience representative of all groups, parties, and classes in this great city.

Town Meeting is brought to you locally each week by 252 ABC stations, many of which are sponsored locally by progressive American business institutions who believe firmly in the principles of

free discussion exemplified by this program.

Town Meeting is on the air fifty-two weeks each year and is still available for local sponsorship in more than 100 American cities. Your Town Meeting and Town Hall believes in the kind of support provided by local sponsorship as it is thoroughly in the American tradition and always remember it is your local ABC station that is directly responsible for bringing you the Nation's most popular radio forum.

If you enjoy this program, let him know and if you are interested in sponsoring Town Meeting in your locality, call your local ABC station.

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: May we hear first from Judge Thurman Arnold.

Judge Arnold: Mr. Moderator, it's high time that men in Congress stopped trying to make Americans afraid of their own institutions and suspicious of each other. Let's fight Russia with affirmative measures, not with panic. Let's show the Russians that freedom of speech is a source of strength, not of weakness. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Now a final word from Senator Taft.

Senator Taft: The best weapon against communism is the aggressive, affirmative spreading of the principles of free government throughout the world. Neverthe-

less communism is a great revolutionary movement, a crusade. It is something which we, under our liberty, cannot outlaw, but I do think wherever it undertakes any important activities, we should prohibit those activities to prevent the accomplishment of their purposes. I think, furthermore, we should reveal to the American people the existence of communism, who is a Communist and who is not. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Taft. Now, Mr. McGill, please.

Mr. McGill: All of us are joined in opposition to communism and all of us wish to bring them out into the open and let the people know them. I happen to think that the law, as proposed, would meet with the same fate as the Prohibition Law and for the same reason. I agree thoroughly with Senator Taft. Let us go to work and put our own house in order. Build houses, pass his housing bill, and the public health bill, and let's put our own house in order. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. McGill. Now, Congressman Nixon.

Congressman Nixon: I thoroughly agree with what the previous speakers have said in regard to making democracy better as one of the most effective weapons against communism. The reason that I feel very, very strongly and sincerely that intelligent legislation will meet the communist evil to expose the communists for what

they are, and to keep them from accomplishing their ends in the United States is because I feel so strongly that meetings just like this where able people, particularly the three other speakers, can get up and clash with their views, can continue to be held in America. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Nixon, Mr. McGill, Senator Taft, and Judge Thurman Arnold. I want to express our appreciation to our host, the Third National Conference on Citizenship, and station WMAL, here in Washington, for their splendid cooperation. Remember, friends, if you want a copy of tonight's discussion, complete with questions and answers, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin and enclose 10 cents. Just address the Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Next week, your Town Meeting begins its summer tour of the Midwest and Pacific Coast. Don't forget, your Town Meeting is on the air 52 weeks each year. Half the

time in New York and half the time in representative cities throughout the country.

Next week we'll be in Springfield, Ohio, where our subject will be "What's Wrong With Our Cities?" We'll have as our speakers Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin; Hubert Humphry, Mayor of Minneapolis; Frank J. Lausche, former governor of Ohio; and a candidate for that office again; and Robert H. Armstrong, president of Armstrong Associates of New York, and a nationally known real estate appraiser.

Judging by our mail, our Town Meeting audience grows each week. You Town Criers who have been using your telephones, continue to use them. The modern Town Crier's bell is the way to increase this Town Meeting audience. You've been doing a great job. We hope you'll keep it up. So, make your plans to be with us next Tuesday, and every Tuesday at the sound of the Crier's bell. *(Applause.)*

STILL AVAILABLE AT \$1.00 (Postpaid) - - -

A LIMITED NUMBER OF COPIES OF

500 HOURS OLD

A record of the first 500 broadcasts of "America's Town Meeting of the Air," including Titles and Panels of all Programs, Names of all 1176 Speakers, Thirty-two Photographs, etc.

Order from TOWN HALL, INC., 123 W. 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last

VOLUME 13

13. Can We Have An Effective World Organization Without Russia?
14. What Should Be Our Policy for Aiding Europe Now?
15. Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?
16. Have Women Failed As Homemakers?
17. Are We Giving Our American Indian a Square Deal?
18. Can Free Enterprise Here Compete With Socialism Abroad?
20. How Can We Make the United Nations Work?
21. How Can We Stop Rising Prices?
22. Should We Accept the New Fashions for Women?
23. On What Basis Can Our Differences With Russia Be Solved?
25. What Should We Do for Europe Now?
26. How Can We Keep America's Economy Free and Strong?
29. What Should We Do To Check Rising Prices?
31. What Future for Europe?
32. Are Civil Liberties Threatened in America?
33. How Can We Combat Anti-American Propaganda in Europe?
34. How Can We Maintain Prosperity and Avert Depression?
35. Is Christianity Losing to Materialism?
36. Which Road to Peace in 1948?
38. Should the President's European Recovery Plan Be Adopted?
39. How Can We Find Peace of Mind in This Atomic Age?
40. Should the President's Tax Plan Be Adopted?
41. Is Big Business Too Big?
42. How Can Peace Be Maintained in Palestine?
43. Are We Losing Our Moral Standards?
44. Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan Now Before Congress Be Adopted?
45. What's Wrong With the Cominform?
46. Is Our Free Enterprise System Threatened by European Socialism?
47. Which Way America — Fascism, Communism, Socialism, or Democracy?
48. Should the President's Civil Rights Program Be Adopted?
49. Is Universal Military Training Necessary for Our Defense?
50. How Can We Meet the Challenge of Russia's Expansion in Europe?
51. How Can We Preserve Peace and Freedom Today?
52. What Next in Europe Now?

VOLUME 14

1. Will the Third Party Bring Us Prosperity and Prosperity?
2. Should the United Nations Be Revised With or Without Russia Now?
2. Should We Extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements.

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.

123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: } 26 Weeks for C
\$2.35
Single Copies

Illinois U Library MAY 25, 1948

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



U.S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

What's Wrong With Our Cities?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

FRANK J. LAUSCHE

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, JR.

ROBERT H. ARMSTRONG

(See also page 13)

COMING

—June 1, 1948—

What Will Stop Strikes?

—June 8, 1948—

Whom Should the Republicans Nominate for President?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 5



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MAY 25:

"What's Wrong With Our Cities?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Mayor HUMPHREY	4
Mr. ARMSTRONG	7
Mr. LAUSCHE	9
Senator McCARTHY	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	13
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16



THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 1:

"What Will Stop Strikes?"



THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 8:

"Whom Should the Republicans Nominate for President?"



The Broadcast of May 25, 1948, originated in Memorial Hall, Springfield, Ohio, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.